

tary intelligence plus an immediate return to the firm policy invoked by the President last fall which gave us then some feeling of security.

The lead editorial in the Monday, February 4 edition of the Tampa Tribune, one of my State's great daily newspapers, contains strong and needed words on this subject from which I would like to quote at this time. Before doing so, however, let me say that the Tribune has always taken a bipartisan attitude on national affairs and is not a habitual critic of either the Democratic Party or the present administration. Most importantly, Tribune editorials almost invariably reflect the thinking of large numbers of its many thousands of readers.

In an editorial entitled "A Monument to Failure" the Tribune stated, in part:

Fidel Castro has turned up in a new role. As a patron of the arts, he has scraped up \$15,000 in prize money and has invited architects the world over to submit designs for a \$2 million monument commemorating the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion.

When it is completed it will stand not only as a memorial to the Bay of Pigs fiasco but as one to the miserable failure of the United States to deal effectively with what now has become an entrenched Communist bridgehead in the Western Hemisphere.

Despite White House denials that there has been a recent Soviet "military influx" into Cuba evidence accumulates that the Russians are continuing to strengthen their Cuban arsenal and that the United States is doing nothing about it.

While the Pentagon and State Department shrug off such reports, they are largely supported by stories of refugees coming out of Cuba who say that both Russian troops and arms continue to pour into the island.

One might feel more confidence in the Government's intelligence reports had not their shortcomings been evident during the missile buildup last fall.

Defense Secretary McNamara told a congressional committee late last week that the Russian missiles were secretly loaded and transported to Cuba in the holds of large Soviet ships.

"Since all the strategic missile-associated equipment, such as erectors and transporters, and the missiles themselves were concealed in the holds of the ships and unloaded under the cover of darkness, and under most stringent Soviet-controlled security restrictions, photographic surveillance at the time was unable to discover the initial introduction of offensive missiles into Cuba."

How can the Pentagon be so certain that the same technique is not now being employed to smuggle arms and perhaps missiles into Cuba?

Even if Pentagon estimates are accepted, we know that there are 17,000 or more Soviet troops in Cuba. We know that the Soviet arsenal contains a wide variety of ground-to-air missiles, all manner of tanks, artillery, trucks, ammunition, patrol boats and approximately 100 fighter planes.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk concedes "a significant Soviet military presence in Cuba which is of great concern to the United States." But the Kennedy administration is doing precious little to relieve this concern.

It has a "plan" put into effect the regulations, drawn up last fall's showdown with Russia, designed to strangle Cuba's economic life by curtailing its shipping.

In a proposal by Cuba itself for the establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile to

spread the eventual overthrow of the Castro regime.

It has restricted Cuban refugee training seeking to continue harassing attacks on Castro's fortress.

There is no indication that it is supplying or helping build anti-Castro guerrilla forces inside Cuba. Nor are there signs that it is making more than a casual attempt to urge other hemispheric nations to bring increased diplomatic pressure on Cuba.

In short, from all outward signs, the Kennedy administration is sitting still while Fidel builds his monument, a memorial not only to Bay of Pigs but to the failure of the United States to face up to its responsibilities.

The points raised by this editorial are vital ones which deserve the close attention of this body and definitive action by the administration. I am most hopeful that the investigation now being launched by Senator STENNIS' Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating will be effective in correcting the unfortunate situation which now exists. I have been able to supply this subcommittee with some pertinent information, and I will continue to support its work in every possible way. I strongly hope, and I urge, that the executive department will be completely helpful and frank with Senator STENNIS and the other able members of his subcommittee and that early publicity may be given to all of the facts which can be established. My people, and the people of the Nation, in general, are entitled to know what the facts are, and not to be left to choose between the conflicting statements and rumors which now plague them.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an editorial entitled "U.S. Public in Dark on Cuba," published in the Panama City News-Herald of Sunday, February 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. PUBLIC IN DARK ON CUBA

The Kennedy administration is screaming "no" over pressure for a thorough investigation into negotiations between the United States and Russia over Soviet missiles in Cuba, balking demands for a probe are only partisan efforts to discredit the Democratic regime.

Crux of the matter is the removal of American intermediate range missiles from bases in Italy and Turkey concurrent with an apparent buildup of Russian military strength in Cuba. Far from being partisan, demands for more information on the problem are being made by both Republicans and Democrats.

The administration has issued the explanation that its Jupiter missiles are being removed from Italy and Turkey because they are now somewhat obsolete and not needed, that the Polaris submarines can do a better job.

However, the respected London Times has commented that the planned withdrawal of U.S. Jupiter missiles from bases in Italy and Turkey shows that "President Kennedy is prepared to carry out what Mr. Khrushchev demanded as the price of removing Soviet missiles from Cuba."

Senator EDWARD SIMPSON, Wyoming, Republican, went on record last week with the statement that President Kennedy is ful-

THE CUBAN SITUATION

MR. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the very serious problem of the relationship of the United States with the Cuba of Fidel Castro, and quite possibly the Cuba of Nikita Khrushchev.

At the moment there is decided disagreement within the Government itself as to the exact status of the Russian military buildup in Cuba. This apparent lack of adequate military and diplomatic intelligence is dangerous to every American. It particularly troubles the citizens of my State since Florida is in the geographical position of being just 90 miles, less than 10 minutes by jet aircraft, from the site upon which a shooting war might possibly erupt.

But this on-target position is only a part of the problem. Ever since, for the first time in history, the United States became a "country of first refuge," Florida and its citizens have borne the brunt of the refugee problem. For more than 2 years the people of my State have carried the principal load created by a problem not of our making. While we have been more than glad to perform with the typically humane and generous behavior that marks the average American in extending all possible assistance to unfortunate refugees, Florida would welcome accelerated relocation of refugees to other parts of the country. Secondly, its citizens would like to have the assurance of protection from immediate attack which can come only through possession of accurate and timely mili-

CONT.